

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

4 January 2001

Projects Reviewed

Municipal Civic Center
The Ave Project
University of Washington Campus Plan
Lincoln Reservoir Playfields Shelter

Convened: 9:00am

Adjourned: 5:00pm

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse
Ralph Cipriani
Jack Mackie
Cary Moon
Sharon Sutton
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Brad Gassman
Marianne Pulfer

04 JAN 2001 Project: Municipal Civic Center

Phase: Schematic Design Discussion

Previous Review: 2 December 1999 (Scope Briefing), 16 March 2000 (City Hall/ Schematic Design Concept), 20 April 2000 (Open Space Conceptual Design), 18 May 2000 (Concept Briefing), 17 August 2000 (Schematic Design), 21 September 2000 (Schematic Design), 2 November 2000 (Client Group Meeting), 16 November 2000 (Discussion), 7 December 2000

Presenters: Peter Bohlin, Bassetti/Bohlin Cywinski Johnson
Marilyn Brockman, Bassetti/Bohlin Cywinski Johnson
Kathryn Gustafson, Gustafson Partners
Barbara Swift, Swift and Co. Landscape Architects

Attendees: Rodrigo Abela, Gustafson Partner
Sergei Bischak, Bohlin, Cywinski Jackson
Jim Compton, City Council member
Patrick Doherty, DCLU
Ken Johnsen, Shiels Obletz Johnsen
Monica Lake, ESD
Brian Pavlovec, KPFF Consulting Engineers
Neil Powers
Stefanie Pure
Jennifer Ramirez, Legislative Department
Victoria Reed, Arcade Magazine
David Spiker, Hewitt Architects
Brad Tong, SOJ
Kelly Walker, Arcade Magazine
Ruri Yampolsky, Seattle Arts Commission

Time: 2 hours (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00139)

(SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00143)

Action: The Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments on the Council resolutions:

Regarding Council Resolution 30258, the Commission believes that the current design is addressing all of the concerns found within the resolution, and the Commission looks forward to seeing those items requiring continued refinement, as follows:

- Res. Item #A-2 (Bldg.) visibility of Council Chambers: recommended for approval. Commission looks forward to the detailing of the inner wall that make it distinctive as the Council Chambers from the exterior.
- Res. Item #A-3 (Bldg.) reduce blank walls; integrate pedestrian activity with streets: Design direction recommended for approval, but further refinement is needed. The Commission urges team to further develop the steps on the corner of 4th Avenue and James Street and suggests the use of “bowed” planters for the other James Street planters to reduce their bulk and visual impact. The Commission supports the use of the space within the retaining walls at this corner, and champions the small “porthole” windows.
- Res. Item #A-5 (Bldg.) symbolize native and cultural history of Seattle. Design requires further development. The Commission awaits further development from the Arts Program and asks for clarification of the principles that will allow spaces to express multi-cultural activities. The Commission requests a meeting focusing on the Arts Program.
- Res. Item #B-4 (Bldg.) - programming & design of 4th & Cherry corner building. Design requires further discussion of space programming and management. The Commission asks for continued involvement in this discussion but concurs with the design team that the current proposed mass and scale of building at this corner is appropriate.
- Res. Item #B-5 (Bldg.) – better connect cultural café with civic plazas. Requires further refinement. Commission continues to be interested in the development of the entry sequence on Fourth Avenue and the visibility of and access to the interior public spaces from the exterior. The Commission is concerned that the cultural café program is still not sufficiently articulated to ensure that it will engender rich civic and social activity in the public areas and plaza. The Commission is also concerned that the retail spaces have a variety of offerings and not be exclusionary (too up-scale). Further, the Commission urges the team to study pedestrian traffic flow in relation to planned and serendipitous activity so as create for engagement between “walkers and dwellers”. The Commission stresses the need for frequent and varied interactions among citizens.
- Res. Item #B-2 (Plaza) – more user-friendly spaces integrated with stairs and plazas Design requires further refinement. Commission asks

for more development.

- Res. Item #B-4 (Plaza) - more softscape to ease retaining walls and hard surfaces: recommended for approval. The Commission urges the City to establish a management entity, whether through contract or as a separate function of an existing City department, specifically for the Civic Center spaces, to assure that proper maintenance is provided to the plaza. Lacking a management group, the Commission asks for assurance that the maintenance of the hedges can be accomplished by custodial staff if such were to occur.

Regarding Council Concept approval:

- CCA Item #A-1 - sidewalk width departures: recommended for approval. The Commission further supports the slight “slaloming” of the sidewalk and the placement of the columns on the SW corner.
- CCA Item #A-3 - minimum façade heights: recommended for approval. The Commission asserts that on 4th Avenue the minimum façade height is not applicable and that the variation from code is too incidental to consider on the corner of 4th and Cherry Street.
- CCA Item #A-4 - façade transparency: Transparency recommended for approval. The Commission is confident that further development will meet the spirit if not the requirement and applauds the glazed widow’s walk at the rounded corner of the building. Commission looks forward to further development of the hearth and feels its exterior articulation will help in expressing interior activity and relieving the façade transparencies.
- CCA Item #A-5 – blank façade limits. Limits recommended for approval. As with CCA Item #4, - the Commission is confident that further development will meet the spirit if not the actual requirement. The Commission agrees with the design team that additional windows are not necessary at the base of the elevation, and that the proposed corner window and landscape treatments will meet this design intent.

Regarding other elements of the design:

- The Commission supports the water feature as a unifying element to the campus, and is satisfied that the Design Team will ensure that it will be practical and feasible to operate. The Commission notes the importance of including a sensor so that the flow of water can be

regulated during inclement weather. The Commission supports working with SEATLAN and other City departments to address their concerns so that the water can be continuously visible through the campus and across the streets.

- The Commission seeks the cooperation and support of both SEATLAN and WSDOT in investigating the possibility of closing one or both HOV entries/exits onto/off of I-5, and/or other measures to help reduce auto traffic impacts on pedestrian connections between the new Civic Center and Key Tower. Professional studies and adequate technical documentation should be provided to the City of Seattle and WSDOT to adequately assess opportunities and possibilities to enhance this pedestrian unfriendly intersection at Cherry and 5th Avenues.
- The Commission suggests that more informal drawings can be used for presentations to the Design Commission.

The team addressed the Concept Approval and Resolution items with the intention of resolving lingering concerns over Schematic Design. The team will be going back to Council on January 17th and to the full Council after that. The team is continuing to refine the design with particular attention to the west façade. They intend to match the ceilings of the rooms in the towers independent of what they are used for in order to have these corner rooms be attractive when viewed from below by passerby. As requested, the north face is more open than before to make the City Hall feel more accessible. The loading dock on the south side remains, but the streetwall has been broken up with hanging vines. As viewed from the west, the only box that extends above the plinth is the stair tower. The multi-purpose lobby is to have a fireplace flanked by windows on each side and a kitchen area is planned next to the lobby. The team would like the exterior glazing to be continuous so that the fireplace is not visible and would like to have no visible solid elements on the south side, but wish to achieve this without spandrel glass. In keeping with the idea of making government visible, the exterior southwest corner has been opened up and rounded off to the layer of the railing so that it reads now like a widow's walk. It is anticipated that this will be one of the building's great rooms though of a small scale. The stairway on this corner is larger and provides a more generous connection. The team does not want a lot of small windows on the south side and are convinced that the blank wall is relieved by the planters in front of the wall. The team continues to develop the café area both inside and out, is considering the underside of the stairway as usable space and is intending to use the slab and columns of the existing stair as part of the new stair.

The design team outlined changes including planters and vines on James Street, the modulation of the facing stone, and to lower the heights of the landscaping. A model of the proposed grating for the water trough that is to traverse 4th and 5th Avenues was present and an assurance was given that it would only need to be maintained once annually and would not have significant problems due to freezing.

The activities of Civic Center Programming Focus Group were reported. The group has come up with a set of recommendations that defines the quality and character of the public spaces. The recommendations pertain to management issues and overall general and specific uses. The group has significant concerns about the maintenance of the site and propose that a management entity be established to oversee the public spaces of both the interior and the exterior of the buildings (whether it is part of the city or not). The entity should be specifically staffed, budgeted and dedicated to management. In terms of general uses, the group agrees that there should be retail uses on all of the blocks, but that they should be discrete and defer to civic uses. The group endorses the idea of exhibition spaces and supports a variety of shops, the Cultural Café and other restaurant spaces. As regards specific uses, the group supports the inclusion of a city retail shop offering such items as GIS maps and a range of public meeting facilities.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Is curious to know what the character of the space is like between the columns and the façade.
 - Proponents confirm that the edge will be broken up and softened by the columns but that there will not be a problem with people getting their heads stuck in the space.
- Would like to know how demonstrators can address the Mayor or City Council.
 - Proponents identified three key points in the plaza where this would be possible and stated that the best would be from the main staircase landing.
- Asks for clarification as to how people get into and through the building as opposed to dwelling in them and participating in social activities.
- Fearing ad-hoc solutions questions how the issue of security is being

addressed given the amount of open space.

- Asks if there will be problems if the water needs to be shut off.
 - Proponents stated that the individual water events would have separate shut-offs so that everything will not have to be shut down if there is a problem with one component.
- Wants to know if the architecture will have a regional expression.
 - Proponents assured the Commission that they are working on this.
- Is concerned that it has been a long time since there has been a solid discussion about the Art Program. Asks what Native American artists are going to be included since different artists have radically different interpretations of Native American culture.
 - Proponents stated that the Arts Commission has not yet made the decisions and suggested a separate meeting should be scheduled to look at this.
- Wants to know if the expression of culture is simply artifact-based or if it will be addressed in programmatic and functional ways. Wants to know what principles will be used in expressing multiple cultures.
 - Proponents state that the building will not just have fixed exhibits that express Native American culture, but the building itself offers a cultural forum. A wall is being designated as a History Wall and will be available for changing exhibits. Proponents stated that in addition to artifacts there would be opportunities for modern expression. A display in the café will allude to city electrical usage and exposed water pipes will refer to water use.

4 Jan 2001 Project: **The Ave Project**
 Phase: Design Update
 Previous Reviews: 1 July 1999 (Scope Briefing)
 Presenter: Robert Gorman, SEATRAN
 John Owen, Makers Architecture and Urban Design
 Mary Hamilt, Seattle Arts Commission
 Patty Whistler, The Ave Group
 Attendees: Brodie Bain, Weinstein/Copeland
 Shane DeWald, SEATRAN
 Thanasom Kamolratanayothin, Makers Architecture and Urban Design
 Lem Madson, King Co. Metro
 Cheryl Sizov, City Design

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 DC0067)

Action: None. The Commission appreciates the team's presentation and discussion and anticipates further clarification of the public spaces and more specificity on the artwork. The Commission endorses the varied palette of the proposed landscaping in the way that it confirms the variety of activity in the area, but favors a simplification of the additional street elements. The Commission believes that this project and others like it should be made a funding priority for the city after safety related projects. The University is encouraged to accept the positioning of a bus stop on the northwest corner of 41st and the Ave that would replace the one on the corner of Campus Parkway. The Commission encourages the University to recognize the priority of transit.

The team composed of the Ave Project team, SEATRAN and King County Metro reported that 4.1 million dollars in Federal grants have been approved. In March 2000 the design phase was obligated and that is when the design of the project officially started. A project meeting was held in April and a community "kick-off" was held in June; since then the team has been working on preliminary engineering concepts. SEATRAN approved a baseline scope in June 2000. The project is still in the conceptual phase and the intended date for the beginning of construction is not until 2004 unless local money enables the project to start sooner. Estimates range from 6.5 to 8.6 million dollars so initially there is a funding shortfall and some elements of the project may have to be eliminated. The project goals are pedestrian mobility and safety, improve transit speed and reliability and enhance the Ave through urban design and art. The plan involves widening the sidewalks by two feet, replacing the sign and signal system, upgrading the landscape design and replacing the water main. The plan recommends reducing the number of bus stops from five to four stops between Northeast 50th Street and Northeast Campus Parkway which would increase the distance between stops from 500 feet to approximately 800 feet. SEATRAN is preparing the layout of the in-lane bus stops based on the demonstration stops between 42nd and 43rd that indicate improved traffic flow with the "bus-bulbs" that eliminate the need for the busses to maneuver in and out of the traffic lanes. The rationalization for altering the spacing results from Sound Transit's plan to locate a rail station at 43rd. The change to in-lane stops will mean minor delays for general purpose traffic and a slight net increase in parking spaces. The team asserts that these delays are justified by the volume of Metro riders that approximates 50% of all travelers during peak hours. In response to community concerns pedestrian lighting will be increased.

The team executed a survey to determine the stylistic character of the additions and changes based on

two distinct styles in the neighborhood. These are identified as collegiate, or neo-Gothic and a second style that reflects the existing commercial design. The survey volunteers selected a mixture of furniture, pavement, “pedlights”, and bulletin board styles from the two opposing styles characterized as intellectual/institutional/traditional vs. active/diverse/transitional. The San Francisco artist Brian Goggin has not yet provided more exact information on his part of the project but has said that it may involve the intersections, the pavement, the light standards or the bus shelters. He will meet with team members in early February.

The landscape component entails the retention of the mid-block oaks and the addition of a variety of species of trees with irregular spacing to provide gaps for canopies. The trees are to be planted in pits with pervious paving for passive storm water retention. The list of trees includes Columnar Red Maple, Red Spider Pear, Gingko, and the Columnar Tulip Popular.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Asks for clarification as the intention of the lighting scheme.
 - Proponents explained that the primary use is to provide light for pedestrians although fixtures with internal refractors are preferred as they also provide area light.
- Questions if the jumbled combination of the trees is intended to reflect the jumbled nature of the architecture.
 - Proponents confirmed this.
- Asks if the University or Sound Transit will make financial contributions to the project because of the improvements for pedestrians.
 - The University contributed early on in the project with labor but they have not been approached since then. Sound Transit will fund improvements along 43rd Street between the entrance to the tunnel and University Avenue. The sidewalk is to be widened to match the Ave sidewalk.
- Appreciates the descriptive presentation of the street fixtures but is concerned about the character of the spaces created by the changes. The question is more than one of mere appearance; it pertains to what the space feels like and what kind of activity is provided for.
- Asks if an analysis of the economic and cultural issues for the neighborhood has been done that this project is a response to and if so has a business plan been developed.
 - Proponents stated that a Neighborhood Plan has been done and can be provided to the Commission that deals with street improvements and social delivery systems in addition to land use issues.
- Is concerned that the Ave may change from being an assemblage of small owner operated shops to one of chain stores and asks if there is a policy to deal with this.
 - Proponents explained that the neighborhood is not conducive to chains due to a lack of parking, small lots, and codes that regulate the size of streetfront signage. The Ave is zoned Neighborhood Commercial 3-65. It is possible to build five or six-story structures; because this area is regarded as a transportation hub densification is desirable. There are no legal grounds to prevent the development of chains or the consolidation of lots.

4 Jan 2001 Project: **University of Washington Campus Plan**
 Phase: Pre-Petition Street Vacation
 Presenters: Lee Copeland, Weinstein Copeland Architects
 Theresa Doherty, University of Washington
 Jan Arntz, University of Washington
 Bill Talley, University of Washington
 Attendees: Ryan Durham, Hillis Clark
 Brodie Bain ,Weinstein Copeland Architects
 Beverly Barnett, SEATRAN
 Jeff Benesi, Hewitt Architects
 Stephen Lundgren
 Terry McCann, Huckel/Weinman Assoc.
 Cheryl Sizov, City Design

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00207)

Actions: **The Commission appreciates the team's efforts to develop a ten-year Master Plan for the University and makes the following comments and recommendations:**

- **appreciates the flexibility of the plan but would like more information as to what sites are likely to be developed and what kinds of activity these sites would generate in order to ascertain if these activities can be accommodated with the existing infrastructure and neighborhood**
- **requests a historical resources survey of buildings and of the landscape**
- **reinforces their position and city policies that discourage alley vacations and skybridges**
- **is concerned about the further destruction of the street grid with the proposed alley vacations and want the Plan to note any objections on the part of CUCAC or the Urban Center Plan**
- **encourages the team to find additional ways to link the campus to the waterfront especially at night and on weekends**
- **is concerned that all of the views except one show views out from the campus and not into the campus and suggests the team explore the nature of the views in**
- **urges the team to not simply prioritize the University's needs but also look at the needs of the general public and the surrounding neighborhood and would like the Master Plan to detail the benefits to the public and not just people who are primary users of the campus**
- **generally discourages grade separations of pedestrians and vehicles and, where proposed in the Master Plan, would want to see appropriate justification based on site conditions and compelling evidence that the design supports the most vital pedestrian environment for the vicinity**
- **questions in what way the alley vacations and street re-designs benefit the public and suggests a study of 15th Avenue to better understand how the inward-facing**

nature of the University might become more open to the community along that edge

- **concurs with CUCAC that the proposed Master Plan does not have a phased development plan which makes it difficult to evaluate the street vacations.**
- **would appreciate a larger more detailed map that indicates the remaining alleys in the area**
- **would like to see more information about the public use of the pedestrian bridges, how the paths of the campus relate to the area, and at what point on the side of the main campus the bridge will be located**
- **is concerned for the safe accommodation of bus passengers**
- **is negatively disposed to the reconfiguration of the Campus Parkway and would like it to continue to be a boulevard and considers it possible to enliven the open space of the Parkway (that the University gave over to the city) and preserve the spatial integrity and diagrammatic clarity of the entire vista**

The City does not have jurisdiction over the Master Plan of the University; there is an entirely separate process that involves the community and Land Use planning on this issue. The University has not specifically applied for vacations or realignments of the street. The Master Plan is a preliminary document at this time. As each individual project is further developed the Commission can expect to see more specific information on each of the vacations. The Master Plan was issued in October 2000 and the project is in the public comment period. The draft Plan includes four alley vacations, two street vacations and two pedestrian bridges. The team plans to return to the Commission in February or March 2001.

In response to the State Legislature, the University has identified 60 sites for projects and is looking at developing 3 million square feet over the next ten years. The review process with the State Legislature is in place although the projects remain undesignated.

The team outlined the following Alley Vacations:

1. **31W Alley:** Eliminate north/south alley at the southern end of the block between 41st and 42nd Streets and 11th and 12th Avenues. Access would be provided from the alley west to 11th NE enabling alley access to private properties on the remainder of the block.
2. **32W Alley:** close off north/south alley and access to Campus Parkway with continued service to this block in the existing alley right-of-way from 41st Street.
3. **35W Alley:** eliminate north/south alley that bisects University property on the south part of the block between Brooklyn and 12th Avenue NE and Campus Parkway and NE 41st Street.

4. **36W Alley:** eliminate north/south alley between University Avenue and 15th Avenue south of Gould Hall.

The team outlined the following aerial vacations:

1. **Portage Bay Vista Pedestrian Bridge:** connect Physics/Astronomy Plaza to the south side of NE Pacific Street to provide a grade-separated connection to the southeast corner of the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and Pacific Street
2. **14C Pedestrian Bridge:** connect the Burke-Gilman Trail and east campus to the area directly west of the tennis courts over Mountlake Blvd. and half way between the two existing bridges.
3. **Pacific Lid:** (possible future Street Vacation) a landscaped cap that would extend the open space south of the Burke-Gilman trail as a link over NE Pacific Street to the South Campus with the intention of diminishing the impact of NE Pacific as a barrier.

The team discussed the following Street vacations:

1. **11th Avenue NE:** eliminate street that became a dead end with the creation of the Campus Parkway exchange but is used as a service access to Condon Hall. Because of an elevation change the alley does not access Campus Parkway.
2. **Campus Parkway:** move the west-bound side of the street to the south between 12th and 15th Avenues NE with the intention of creating a wider open area.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Asks how the University will develop the infrastructure for new buildings if the development is so flexible.
 - Proponents stated that most of the sites are already served well by the infrastructure of the University but there may have to be increases at the sources to provide for new buildings.
- Asks if changes to Campus Parkway are contingent on the resolution of the traffic issues at the west end of the Parkway.
 - Proponents stated that they are not.
- Questions the concept of “efficient development” which has not been adequately defined. Does not feel that it can be used as a rationale for the proposed vacations 31W and 32W. Fears “efficiency” really means expediency in terms of attracting potential developers. Is concerned about the general erosion of the fabric of the city and fears institutional creep.
- Asks about the possibility of having a pedestrian crossing on Montlake Blvd. Considers it unnecessary to provide for 50mph traffic for this ten block section of Montlake Blvd. Considers traffic flow to be divisive and is opposed to further grade separation that makes Pacific Street and Montlake Blvd. like Aurora Blvd.
- Requests a broader analysis of options be presented to the Commission in regard to the issue raised

by the City University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) representative who is concerned for the way in which the Health Sciences complex blocks access to the shoreline and notes that there is nothing in the proposed Master Plan that would make it possible to get to the waterfront in the evenings or on weekends.

- Proponents stated that the approved Southwest Campus Plan includes improvements to access: Sakuma Point Park has been built and further improvements are planned for the Show Boat Beach, the area next to the Fish Return Ponds and the Portage Bay Vista.
- Asks if the historic resources survey requested by the Department of Neighborhoods will be included in the Master Plan and how will it address such issues as the historic landscape.
 - Proponents are not prepared at this time to say how they are going to respond to this request or requests from other interest groups.
- Asks how and if the Master Plan will respond to CUCAC.
 - The team is aware of CUCAC's concerns regarding Campus Parkway and the possible alley vacations designated 31W and 32W, the Pacific Lid proposal and several other development sites. The team contests CUCAC's allegations that the team is not following the Urban Center Plan.
- Would like to have a description of what kind of activity is likely to occur on the designated 60 sites.

4 JAN 2001 Commission Business

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| ACTION ITEMS | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u> |
| | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 16 NOV 2000 & 7 DEC 2000</u> |
| ANNOUNCEMENTS | C. | <u>LRRP RETREAT ON JAN 12, 8-11AM</u> |
| | D. | <u>RICK'S FAREWELL ON FEB 9TH, 5-7 PM</u> |
| DISCUSSION ITEMS | E. | <u>OPEN SPACE STRATEGY UPDATE/RAHAIM</u> |
| | F. | <u>CITY DESIGN DRAFT PAPER ON CIVIC CENTER</u> |

Attendees: Jerry Arbes, Friends of Seattle's Olmstead Parks/Groundswell
Lowell W. Warren, Tetra Tech/KCM, Inc,
Cheryl Sizov, CityDesign/DCLU
Beth Chave, Dept. of Neighborhoods/Landmarks Board
Helen Wellborn, City Budget Office

Action: The Commission is enthusiastic about the overall plan for the project and makes the following recommendations:

- asks to see a further presentation in the Design Development phase and encourages the use of informal sketches of the structure and “bowl” in elevation and section to help resolve issues concerning both the roof and the style of the structure; asks to see drawings that indicate the materials that might be used
- applauds the inclusion of 24-7 toilets
- concerns about the team’s reluctance to have a roof over the open section of the split-plan design due to a fear of enabling “camping” at the shelter

The team has responded to input from the community by developing a scheme for the playfields shelter that locates the restrooms, activity room, maintenance space and general storage space together in one building. As a result of the site analysis the team has placed the shelter on same level as the Olive Street east/west pedestrian corridor. The proposed center-split building would be sited near the center of the space that looks out onto the “bowl” to the north and to the playfield to the south. By pulling the building apart the structure is made larger than it actually is and allows for a view through the building. Although the building is smaller, the location of most of the functions in one structure is similar to the original Olmstead design. This scheme supported by the Landmarks Board and the Parks Department.

The activity room that can be used year-round will have a small kitchen and an unheated uni-sex bathroom. There are still security issues to be resolved in regards to the toilets and the possible inclusion of eaves as a part of the roof structure.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if the design team considered correcting the asymmetrical shape of the bowl.
 - Proponents stated that this would not be possible due the placement of the utility pump station and the siting of the trees. The proponents are trying to create a balance instead of symmetry.
 - Would like to know if the building will be sited off-center.
 - Proponents stated that an exact location has not been chosen; it is currently difficult to get a sense of the positioning as long as the existing shelter is there. When it is taken down in a few months the footprint can be staked out.
 - Believes that the solution to the homeless problem is not to design inhospitable public places.
 - Asks if it would be possible to have either no roof or an open trellis over the open area. In spite of the problem with the homeless the team is encouraged to look at a roof solution that entails eaves.
 - Proponents stated that they have not reached that point in the design process.
 - Asks if the shape of the roof can enhance the acoustic qualities of the bowl area.
 - Recognizes that the if the shelter mimics the historical structure it may end up looking like a scale model of one.
 - Proponents stated that they intend to keep the building simple and design it for heavy use. Therefore they are considering the use of stone, masonry or stucco.
 - Wants to know how the construction of a Sound Transit station at the proposed location on the west side of the site would impact the project in terms of the decisions about materials or symmetry.
-